Serial No. 10/000,088

Remarks

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 6, 10, 15, 19, 24, 28, 33, and 37 are amended. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-37 are pending and under consideration.

ENTRY OF AMENDMENT UNDER 37 CFR §1.116

Applicant requests entry of this Rule 116 Response because it is believed that the amendment of claims 1, 6, 10, 15, 19, 24, 28, 33, and 37 puts this application into condition for allowance and should not entail any further search by the Examiner since no new features are being added or no new issues are being raised. Claims 1, 10, 19, 28, and 37 are amended to recite, respectively, a personal information management apparatus which electronically manages personal information of a user, a method and a program, using claim 1 as an example, including "a personal information database selection unit selecting a personal information database based on rules from a personal information storage unit including a plurality of personal information databases respectively storing personal information about different situations of the same user." (Emphasis added, see, for example, page 14, lines 1-3). Dependent claims 6, 15, 24, and 33 are amended to correspond to respective independent claims.

ITEM 4: REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-2, 6, 10-11, 15, 19-20, 24, 28-29, 33 AND 37 BY GOYAL ET AL. (U.S.P. 5,873,108)

The Examiner rejects claims 1-2, 6, 10-11, 15, 19-20, 24, 28-29, 33 and 37 as anticipated by Goyal. (Action at pages 2-4).

Independent claims 1, 10, 19, 28, and 37, respectively recite, a personal information management apparatus which electronically manages personal information of a user, a method, and a program, using claim 1 as an example, including "a personal information database selection unit selecting a personal information database based on rules from a personal information storage unit including a plurality of personal information databases respectively storing personal information about different situations of the same user; a processing unit processing the personal information database selected by said personal information database selection unit, such that the personal information can be read and written; and a memory storing the rules referenced for selecting the personal information database, which are set by the same user in advance upon starting a use of the personal information management apparatus."

That is, according to aspects of the present invention, selection is from same categories with different situations.

9

Serial No. 10/000,088

Goyal, on the other hand, teaches selection from different categories. Goyal does <u>not</u> teach a plurality of databases storing personal information about <u>different situations</u> of the <u>same</u> user. Goyal which merely teaches "a calendar/databook database 1907, a phone /address database, and a lists database." That is, Goyal merely teaches storing information about a plurality of individuals.

Further, the Examiner mistakenly contends "setting rules, for selecting personal information databases, by the user" is taught by Goyal:

> wherein Goyal's the user selects entries match the user-determined criteria, the selecting rules, ... messages, etc, the storage, <u>is equivalent to</u> Applicant's setting rules, for selecting personal information databases, by the user in advance upon starting a user of a personal information management apparatus.

(Emphasis added, Action at page 3).

Applicants respectively submit that the Examiner's contention of equivalence is incorrect and <u>unsupported</u>.

Conclusion

Since Goyal does not teach features recited in independent claims 1, 10, 19, 28, and 37 and respective dependent claims, and the Examiner's contention of equivalence is not supported, the rejection should be withdrawn and claims 1-2, 6, 10-11, 15, 19-20, 24, 28-29, 33 and 37 allowed.

ITEM 6: REJECTION OF CLAIMS 3-5, 12-14, 21-23 and 30-32 FOR OBVIOUSNESS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a) OVER GOYAL IN VIEW OF GIROTI (U.S. PUB. 2003/0018700)

Dependent claims 3, 12, 21, and 32 recite, using claim 3 as an example, a "transmission/ reception unit, provided in a network, transmitting and receiving data to and from an information processing terminal through the network, wherein said personal information database selection unit selects the personal information database through the network, or directly selects the personal information database." Claims 4-5, 12-14, 21-23 and 31-32 depending on claims 3, 12, 21, and 30 respectively.

That is, according to an aspect of the present intention, a database is implicitly by selected by detecting a situation difference, e.g., a connection with a network.

The Action concedes that Goyal does not teach the "transmission/reception unit to transmit or receive personal information database through the network," however, the Examiner rejects claims 3-5, 12-14, 21-23 and 30-32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Goyal in view of Giroti. (Action at pages 5-6).

Applicants submit there is no motivation to modify Goyal, as the Examiner contends, to "select personal information database (of the first user) through the network."

10

Serial No. 10/000,088

While Goyal does teach a computing device including a PCMCIA connector, Goyal teaches away from the recited feature of selection "through the network."

Conclusion

Since *prima facie* obviousness is not established, the rejection should be withdrawn and claims 3-5, 12-14, 21-23 and 30-32 allowed.

ITEM 7: REJECTION OF CLAIMS 7-9, 16-18, 25-27 AND 34-36 FOR OBVIOUSNESS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a) OVER GOYAL IN VIEW OF HUANG (U.S.P. 5,966,714)

Dependent claims 7, 16, 25, and 34 using claim 7 as an example, recite "a personal information nonmatching detection unit detecting a difference in personal information of predetermined items common to two personal information databases stored in said personal information storage unit; and a personal information nonmatching notification unit notifying of the difference detected by said personal information nonmatching detection unit." Claims 8-9, 17-18, 26-27, and 35-36 depending on claims 7, 16, 25, and 34 respectively.

That is, according to aspects of the present invention, since databases in a system deal with a same type of information and some profiles are necessarily the same, detection of a unit is "nonmatching" is required.

The Action concedes that Goyal does not "teach detecting the difference between databases and synchronizing the difference," however, the Examiner rejects claims 7-9, 16-18, 25-27 and 34-36 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goyal in view of Huang. (Action at pages 6-8).

Goyal on the other had teaches databases dealing with different types of information, and thus is not concerning about data inconsistency.

Applicants submit there is no reasonable chance of success to modify Goyal as the Examiner contends, and in fact Goyal teaches away from such modification.

In item 9e, entitled Response to Arguments, the Examiner contends:

both references are devoted to personal electronic mails. . . Goyal described . . . a personal information manager consisting of a plurality of databases where maintenance is an unwieldy task. It would have been obvious . . . to combine the two references for resolving the issues as described.

(Action at pages 10-11).

Applicants submit that Goyal does not teach that "installing the databases is a unwieldy task" as the Examiner contends. Rather, Goyal teaches (col. 2, starting at line 14) that:

. . . in each operational mode, information may be input and retrieved differently. As a result, known personal information managers are unduly complex and unwieldy . .

Serial No. 10/000,088

. the personal information manager is based on ... different types of information to be entered from a single screen display in a consistent manner."

(Emphasis added).

That is, Goyal teaches away from a comparison of multiple information databases by a consistent data entry, and thus teaches <u>away</u> from the Examiner's contended modification.

Conclusion

Since there is no motivation or reasonable chance of success to combine the art, and *prima facie* obviousness is not established, the rejection should be withdrawn and claims 7-9, 16-18, 25-27 and 34-36 allowed.

<u>Conclusion</u>

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: *March 16, 2005*   By: *Paul W. Bobowiec*

                                              Paul W. Bobowiec
                                              Registration No. 47,431

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

12